	Page 1
UNITED STATES D	DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT C	F OREGON
PORTLAND	DIVISION
OREGON FIREARMS FEDERATION, INC., et al., Plaintiffs, v. KATE BROWN, et al., Defendants.))) Case Nos.) 2:22-cv-01815-IM) 3:22-cv-01869-IM) 3:22-CV-01869-IM
(Continued)))))
* VIDEOCONF VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION U OF KEVIN L.	JPON ORAL EXAMINATION
Witness lo	cated in:
Lake Osweg	o, Oregon
* All participants appear	
DATE TAKEN: January 17, 202	3
REPORTED BY: Tia B. Reidt, W	Jashington RPR, CSR #2798

		Page 2
1 2	(Continued)	
3	MARK FITZ, et al.,)	
4	Plaintiffs,) v.)	
5	ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al.,)	
6	Defendants.)	
7	KATERINA B. EYRE, et al.,	
9	Plaintiffs,) v.)	
10	ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al.,)	
l1	Defendants.)	
2	DANIEL AZZOPARDI, et al.,	
.3	Plaintiffs,) v.)	
.4	ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al.,)	
L5	Defendants.)	
.6 .7		
.8		
.9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
ر.		

				Page 3
1				APPEARANCES
2				
	For	the	Eyre Pla	aintiffs:
3				SHAWN M. LINDSAY
4				JURISLAW, LLP
5				Three Centerpointe Drive, Suite 160 Lake Oswego, OR 97035
5				(503) 968-1475
6				Shawn@jurislawyer.com
7	For	+ho	Defendar	nte:
8	FOI	CITE	Defendar	105.
0				HARRY WILSON MARKOWITZ HERBOLD
9				1455 SW Broadway, Suite 1900
10				Portland, OR 97201 (503) 972-5076
11				Harrywilson@markowitzherbold.com
12				
			-	l Intervenor-Defendant Oregon Alliance
13	Ior	Gun	Safety:	
14				ZACHARY J. PEKELIS PACIFICA LAW GROUP
15				1191 Second Avenue, Suite 2000
16				Seattle, WA 98101 (206) 245-1700
10				Zach.Pekelis@PacificaLawGroup.com
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1	
	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED
2	For Counsel to Oregon Association Chiefs of Police:
3	AKIN BLITZ BULLARD LAW
4	200 SW Broadway, Suite 1950
5	Portland, OR 97225 (503) 784-1766 Ablitz@bullardlaw.com
6	ADITCZ@Ddildidiaw.com
7	Videographer:
8	ED BURKE BUELL REALTIME REPORTING
9	1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, WA 98101
10	(206) 287-9066 Info@buellrealtime.com
11	IIIIO@DuCIIICaicime.com
12	* * * *
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 15 That's correct. 1 Q. Okay. 2 I would like to mark two MR. WILSON: 3 exhibits, that's the declaration and your second 4 declaration. I have emailed copies of those to the 5 court reporter. 6 Mr. Campbell, do you have copies of those in 7 front of you? 8 I do. THE WITNESS: 9 MR. WILSON: Okay. 10 THE COURT REPORTER: One moment. I'll get 11 those marked. 12 (Exhibit 6 marked for identification.) 13 (Exhibit 7 marked for identification.) 14 THE COURT REPORTER: Exhibit 6 and Exhibit 15 7 have been marked. 16 BY MR. WILSON: 17 I believe -- just so we're clear on the 18 record, I'm going to consider Exhibit 6 to be your 19 first declaration, Mr. Campbell, and Exhibit 7 to be 20 21 your second declaration. Great. Thank you. Α. 22 So Mr. Campbell, can you tell me in a general 23 way why you submitted these declarations? 24 Yes, I will. So let me -- let me say to be 25

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC 206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

Page 5 of 10

begin with, and I think we've made this clear all along, that we believe it's the court's exclusive jurisdiction to determine issues of constitutionality.

When a law is passed, we implement the law.

That's our responsibility. We enforce the law to the greatest ability.

So the purpose of submitting these was, really, to be helpful to the court as the court is trying to understand the impacts of specifically the permit to purchase part of Ballot Measure 114 and the challenges to implement that local police -- municipal police department's face as we try to navigate that new responsibility. That was our exclusive reason for submitting information to the court.

Q. Got it.

Just a moment ago, we discussed that you had submitted your declarations in connection with the case filed by, among other plaintiffs, Katerina Eyre; correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And were you asked by one of the plaintiffs in that case to provide the declaration?
- A. I was not. I was asked by Elmer Dickens.

 Elmer is the legal counsel for the Oregon State

 Sheriffs' Association. I think he was trying to find a

Personnel has to be put in place which don't currently exist in the municipal side. So we're really looking at how quickly -- even if it's legally possible to do, how quickly can we practically operationalize a permit to purchase process.

- Q. So based on the two categories I just identified, other than the fingerprint issue, are you aware of any other obstacle to the implementation of Measure 114 that would legally prohibit the issuance of permits?
- A. I am not -- I am not aware or cannot remember if there are any others that would represent a legal obstacle to implementing this.
 - Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

<u>6</u>

<u>Z</u>

8

9

<u>10</u>

<u>11</u>

<u>12</u>

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Other than whatever the courts decide on this. Obviously, the courts have an impact.
 - O. Yeah.

And I guess we should just put that on the record too.

You understand that the Federal Court has stayed enforcement of the permit requirement until March 8th; correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And that the State Court has stayed all of Measure 114, at least on a preliminary basis; correct?

for one in many of these agencies. I would say yes.

Q. So if Measure 114 were to go into effect, for example, if the injunctions were lifted by the various courts and the fingerprint issue was otherwise resolved, agencies would make determinations about implementation of Measure 114 by weighing that implementation versus the other demands on their resources.

Is that fair?

A. I don't know if that's fair for me to say. I mean, every jurisdiction is going to make their own determinations based on their priorities. And I don't know -- it's been my impression that agencies have, in a resource-constrained environment, struggled just to provide basic public safety services.

And so this is a new -- it's a new expectation that's going to be in place. I think the public who are wanting to purchase a firearm are going to expect that police agencies are able to process their permit. So there's a public expectation, I think, out there. And that will make -- that will put agencies in a very difficult situation because of their resource constraints.

Q. Are you aware of any municipal police agency that has stated that it would flat out refuse to

implement Measure 114?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

<u>13</u>

<u>14</u>

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. No. But I'm not -- I would not be surprised if there are some out there. I would -- and it may just be because of -- they don't believe they can actually manage it in terms of the administrative burden. There may be other reasons, but I have not heard that.
 - Q. Okay.
 So you're not aware of --
- A. That doesn't mean there aren't folks out there for sure.
 - Q. Okay.

 You're not aware of any particular agency?
 - A. No.
- Q. Do you expect that there would be any date or any time in the future when you would be able to provide an estimate about how much time remains necessary to implement Measure 114?
- A. I'd like to be able to give you a time, but I'm just really not sure at this point.
- Q. And I'm sorry to keep asking this question over and over --
 - A. That's all right.
- Q. -- but I just want to get as best a sense as I can.

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

1

STATE OF WASHINGTON

COUNTY OF PIERCE

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the deposition of Kevin L. Campbell, having been duly sworn, on January 17, 2023, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 24th day of January, 2023.



/S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #22-0001 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires 5/15/2026.

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989